DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 559 UD 022 505

AUTHOR Zafirau, S. James
TITLE A Study of Attendance Issues in a Desegregating School District.
PUB DATE 15 Mar 82
NOTE 55p.; Some tables marginally legible.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Academic Failure; *Average Daily Attendance; Corporal Punishment; Grade Repetition; Minority Groups; Multiple Regression Analysis; *Predictor Variables; Racial Composition; Reading Comprehension; Secondary Education; Socioeconomic Status; Suspension; Teacher Attendance; Whites

ABSTRACT

Attendance rates and selected academic and school climate indicators in 39 secondary schools in Cleveland, Ohio, were studied by ranking and grouping the schools into the top third, the middle third, and the lowest third, based on attendance rates. Compared to the group of schools with highest attendance rates, the schools composing the lowest group had significantly greater: suspension rates; percent of total F grades in English, mathematics, science, and social studies; non-promotion rates for black students; and student poverty rates. Schools in the top groups had significantly higher school-wide average reading comprehension scores. Although the differences were not statistically significant, the top group (compared to the lowest group) had lower: non-promotion rates for whites; minority-to-white reading comprehension score disparities; suspension rates; teacher absenteeism rates; and corporal punishment rates. Multiple regression analysis using the school indices as predictors of a school's average daily attendance indicated that academic indicators (those relating to achievement) are more powerful predictors than non-academic or school process indicators (teacher absenteeism, student suspension, racial composition, and poverty level). The findings suggest that the attendance problem will not be fundamentally remedied until actual academic performance is improved. (Author/MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220559

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. James Zafirau
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A STUDY OF ATTENDANCE ISSUES IN A DESEGREGATING SCHOOL DISTRICT

S. James Zafirau

March 15, 1982

UD022 505

A STUDY OF ATTENDANCE ISSUES IN
A DESEGREGATING SCHOOL DISTRICT

FINDINGS

Phase I: Comparing High and Low Attendance Rate Schools

Using the 1980-81 school year data, the thirty-nine secondary schools in the Cleveland City School District were divided into three equal one-third groups in terms of their attendance rate. The lowest attendance rate one-third of the secondary schools, when contrasted to the highest attendance rate one-third of the secondary schools using selected school climate related indices, had a significantly ($p<.05$ and in order) greater:

- suspension rate for failure to attend all classes (17.1% vs. 8.5%);
- percent of total F grades given in each of the four major subject areas: English (33.7% vs. 20.9%), mathematics (43.3% vs. 25.7%), science (39.5% vs. 20.5%) and social studies (36.2% vs. 25.3%);
- suspension rate for failure to attend school/classes on time (13.9% vs. 3.6%);
- non-promotion rate for black students (but not for the 'other', non-black, primarily white students -- although theirs was higher by almost 3 NCE's it wasn't significant at $p<.05$; .31 vs. .13);

. student poverty rate (73.2% vs. 63.8%).

The highest attendance rate schools had a significantly higher school-wide average reading comprehension post-test score.

Although not achieving statistical significance ($p<.05$), the high attendance rate one-third of schools, in comparison to the low attendance rate schools had, in order:

. a lower non-promote rate for non-black (mostly white) 'others' (.2146 vs. .4296; p=.09);

. a smaller minority to white reading comprehension post-test score discrepancy (computed by subtracting the average white score from the average minority score, - 6.4 NCE vs. - 8.5 NCE; p=.16);

. a smaller suspension rate for each of the remaining three suspension reasons investigated --

  . disruption of entire school (15.0 vs. 21.5; p=.12);

  . failure to comply (10.8 vs. 15.0; p=.26);

  . fighting, hitting, pushing (14.5 vs. 16.1; p=.71).

. a smaller teacher absenteeism rate (5.9 vs. 6.4; p=.39);

. a less negative reading comprehension NCE gain score (-.1553 vs. -.8963; p=.61);

. a smaller minority to white reading comprehension gain score discrepancy (computed by substracting the average white student gain score from the average minority gain score; .8892 vs. .9742; p=.91);

. a lower corporal punishment rate (for those schools with corporal punishment data it was 28.3 vs. 29.3; p=.94).

When viewed in the composite, and in conjunction with the first set of statistically significant findings, the pattern remains clear and becomes reinforced. The student attendance profile of a school is related to school indicators of student academic success (student failure rate, non-promote rate, reading comprehension achievement etc.) and the presence or absence of acceptable student behaviors (as indicated through the suspension rates for various reasons, rate of corporal punishment). See Appendix A for more statistical detail.

Phase II: Models for Predicting School-Average Daily Attendance Rate

The preceding analyses treated the relationship of a school's overall attendance pattern to a set of school indices on a one by one basis. In reality, the full and complete picture requires that such influences be considered together, since they occur in real life in an interactive way. Towards this end, the variance in a school's average daily attendance was predicted utilizing available school indices as predictors of a school's average daily attendance (ADA) rate (using stepwise multiple regression procedures).

Entering the Total Set of Indices in Developmental Order

Since the average student poverty rate and the racial composition of a school (as measured by percent of white students enrolled) were givens for a school at the beginning of the 1980-81 school year, and were variables over which the school had no control, they were

entered in the predictive equation first, together. Poverty rate accounted for 2.26% and percent of whites for 1.38% of the variance in the average attendance rate, for a total of 3.64% combined.

Next, the non-academic school process indices of the teacher absence rate and total student suspension rates were simultaniously entered, and accounted for additional amounts of 9.96% and 4.84% of explained variance of a school's ADA rate. It is noteworthy that not only are these two indices under some significant control of school, but that their unique and additional explanitory power of the ADA rate is over four times that of poverty rate and a school's racial composition combined. Teacher absenteeism may provide to some sig-inficant degree a unique 'role modeling' influence for their students, or may simply reflect an overall total school climate of low motivation or morale, high wear and tear, and the like. At this point in building the predictive model, 18.44% of the total variance in ADA rate was explained by the four variables described.

At the third step, two school academic performance indices were added to the equation——two reading comprehension gain score based variables. The school average reading comprehension gain score explained an additional 9.54% variance and the school-wide minority to white comprehension gain score difference explained another 1.5%, for an accumulated 29.5% of the ADA rate explained at this point in the analysis. The gain score is an average rate of reading comprehension growth index, and as such is a measure of academic vitality and health during the 1980-81 school year. Apparently in those schools with high attendance, the overall student body is experiencing a more positive

in terms of their own growth but additionally in terms of their achievement relative to others have that much more reason to be more conscientious and motivated to attend their school and classes with interest and motivation to learn. Those who so attend will achieve at a greater rate, and those who achieve will tend to have a better attendance rate. Again, a synergistic interplay between these variables is at work in producing such school-wide success.

The climate produced by the many affects the behavior of each individual, just as the behavior and attitudes of each individual contributes to the overall way the school as a social system functions.

At the fifth step in the solution the total school-wide percent of non-promotes given at the 1980-81 school year was entered. After all the prior variables' common variance was partialed out of the non-promote rate, the remaining unique contribution of the non-promote rate explained an additional 8.6% of the variance in the ADA rate, for a cumulative total at the end of this step five of 68.9% explained variance. This may signify at least in part, that there are varying non-promote policies between schools, and that those more severe policies may induce more negative climate which in turns fosters a higher absenteeism rate. Both the possibility that this is true and its implications for enhancing attendance and overall school success deserve further system-wide research and policy study.

At the final step in this predictive modeling solution the school-wide percent of failing grades given was entered. It was entered last for two reasons: (A) it was an end-of-year summation of the academic year activity and achievement which did or did not occur, and on a timeline was subsequent to all of the other variables with the possible exception of the non-promote rate; and (B) it had the

educational experience as is evidenced by their higher rate of reading comprehension growth. There is probably a synergistic effect active here. That is, in a relatively better growth climate, the average student is likely to be more conscientious regarding his/her attendance, and is likely to attend classes more interested and highly motivated to learn.

At the fourth step of the equation, two end-of-year, post-test reading comprehension based variables were entered. The school average reading comprehension post-test score added a full 18.7% of additional explanatory power to the predictive equation and the average minority to white student reading comprehension post-test disparity (difference) added another 12.1% of explanatory power (for a cumulative total explained variance at this point in the solution of 60.3%).

The latter of these two variables signifies the positive influence on attendance that low race-based disparity has on overall school attendance. The significant contribution of the school-wide average (nationally-normed) reading comprehension post-test score signifies that -- in addition to growth within oneself and in addition to the relative standing of oneself or one's (racial) group to others in the immediate school building -- an individual's or group's standing with respect to a standarized total society based achievement norm is also consequential. In this equation both reading comprehension post-test and gain scores make significant contributions towards predicting the overall school attendance rate, which by implication denote a relationship to student self-concept and perceived success with respect to school and to self. Those students who experience success not only

highest simple correlation coefficient with the dependent variable, ADA rate, a very substantial - .88.2% which, if entered earlier in the solution, would have suppressed finding significant explanatory contributions for a number of the clearly antecedent predictor variables. Even after the combined common variance of the preceding nine variables was partialed out of the school-wide percent of F grades index, this failure rate index still explained an additional 17.7% of variance in average daily attendance rate, for a very substantial cumulative total of explained variance for ADA of 86.6% (R^2=.931).

Insert Table 1 here.

It is apparent from this that the relationship between F grades and non-promotions varies from school to school, denoting that differing operational policies exist between schools with regards to the relationship between non-promotion and failing grade. See Table 1 for greater statistical detail of this stepwise multiple regression solution. One insight into this is provided by the fact that although percent of failure is more highly correlated with the average daily attendance rate (-.88) and reading comprehension post-test score (-.58) than is the non-promote rate (-.58 and -.16, respectively), the non-promote rate is more highly correlated with the reading comprehension gain score (.66) and the post-test racial discrepancy score (average minority post-test score minus the average white post-test score; r=-.54) than was the failure rate (.12 and .35, respectively). See Table 2 for greater statistical detail. Also see Appendix B. The post-test discrepancy score denotes that as the average minority post-test

score approaches that of the average white post-test score, the overall school non-promote rate goes down, and does so with more certainty than it does for the failure rate.

Insert Table 2 here.

As with the non-promote rate, the school-wide failure rate variance between schools has a very large association with the ADA rate which is not explanable by basic academic achievement indices such as reading comprehension post-test or gain scores, racial composition, povery rate, racial composition, total suspension rate, teacher absenteeism rate or even the overall school non-promote rate. As with the non-promote rate, this denotes differing grading policies between schools. Where subject failures tend to denote to a greater extent attendance grades, a dangerous cycle may follow, causing more serious attendance problems rather than improving attendance. Such issues deserve further research and policy study.

If the post-test and gain score based discrepancy indices are omitted from the predictor list, total explained variance of average daily attendance rate only drops .8% (from 86.6% to 85.8%).

This same stepwise multiple regression procedure was used with different subsets of these predictor variables, to enable a focusing on different types of influences.

Predicting School Average Daily Attendance Rate from Academic Performance Indices

The set of five school-wide academic performance indices were used to predict the average daily attendance rate of a school. Together, these five indices explained 80.5% of the variance in the average daily attendance rate. The first four indices entered were: the average reading comprehension gain score, the difference between the school average minority and white gain scores, the average reading comprehension post-test score, and the difference between the school average minority and white reading comprehension post-test scores. Together, these four indices accounted for 48.1% of total average daily attendance variance. At the second step the non-promote rate was added for an addtional 7.3% of explained variance, bringing the cumulative total explained variance up to 55.4%. At the final step, percent of failing grades was entered, adding still another 25.0% of explained variance, for the final cumulative total explained variance of 80.5%. See Table 3 for more statistical detail.

Insert Table 3 here.

Predicting School Attendance from Non-Academic Indicators

When the set of four non-academic indices are used to predict the student absenteeism rate in a school, a total of only 18.4% of variance is explained. This suggests that academic rather than non-academic (although non-academic indicators do contribute uniquely and significantly to the absenteeism rate) indicators are more powerful in predicting a school's average daily attendance. This suggests that

those who are experiencing academic success are more likely to have better attendance, and that there is also a composite school-wide effort for these dynamics, since the units of analyses used were school-wide indices rather than measurements of individual students. The four non-academic predictor indices used, in the order of their importance for predicting the 18.4% of variance in school-wide average daily attendance are: teacher absenteeism rate for the school (10.9%), student suspension rate for all reasons (5.4%), percent of white students in the school (1.9%) and the school's poverty rate (.1%). See Table 4 for more statistical detail.

Insert Table 4 here.

Predicting School Attendance from School Process Indicators

The final set of indices used to predict the ADA rate are four measures of school process, both academic and non-academic, which contributed to the prediction of ADA rate in the following order: teacher absenteeism rate (10.9%), student suspension rate for all reasons (5.4%), the average reading comprehension gain score (6.9%; a measure of overall academic vitality and student growth during the period under investigation), and the school-wide disparity between average minority and average white reading comprehension gain scores (1.8%, which relates to school experience based perceptions of inter-racial success and related worth). These four school process indices combine to explain 25.1% of variance in the ADA rate. (See Table 5

for greater statistical detail.) Although reflecting an improvement in predictive power over the set of non-academic indices, school process indices still fall far short of the predictive power of the full set of indices which includes the academic outcome indices (two reading comprehension based indices, the non-promote rate and the failure rate), in addition to the academic process measures included here.

Insert Table 5 here.

Summary of Findings

The academic outcome indices are clearly the most powerful of the indices for predicting attendance rate. This suggests that the attendance problem will not be fundamentally remediated until actual academic performance is improved. From this it would follow that, although procedures for dealing directly with flagrant truancy are necessary, frontal attacks on excessive student absenteeism alone will not change the underlying basic causes of absenteeism. These underlying factors have to do with: (A) the interaction of student, teacher and staff motivation and committment to excel in the teaching-learning process because it is perceived as interesting and important; (B) the broad based support of parents and community to do their part in achieving this educational process and outcome excellence; and (C) the reality based perception and knowledge of students, teachers and parents that this excellence of educational outcomes is in fact happening individually and in the composite.

If a student or a school-wide group of students themselves perceive (and moreover receive confirming feedback from significant others)

that what they are doing in school is successful and important, they will predictably have better attendance.

Another central failure rate issue is that -- in addition to its objectively measured academic achievement meaning -- a failing grade has also become an attendance mark in these secondary schools. That is, an F grade may be given when very low attendance is involved, irrespective at times of adequate subject matter success as measured by a standardized test. Although in the real world of work excessive absenteeism would be grounds for termination of employment, this argument applied directly to grading policy may not be as valid for a variety of reasons, and may even be counter-productive by adding additional fuel to the failure/absenteeism cycle. It may be more constructive to try alternative methods for reducing absenteeism. In particular, positive reinforcement strategies for attending should be sought in preference to punitive responses to absenteeism, since such punitive responses have unintended and typically undesireable side effects.

Further study of the policy and practice issues which relate to absenteeism, student failure, school and non-school facts and processes -- and their interaction -- is needed.

Table 1

STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF SCHOOL AVERAGE DAILY

ATTENDANCE RATE FROM TEN SELECTED SCHOOL AND NON-SCHOOL, PROCESS AND PRODUCT INDICES

MULTIPLE REGRESSION — VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 1

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. PADA 1980-81 AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN %

SUMMARY TABLE

	VARIABLE		MULTIPLE R	R SQUARE	RSQ CHANGE	SIMPLE R	B	BETA
1	FDVRATE	% OF 1980-81 STUDENTS EATING FREE LUNCH	0.15032	0.02260	0.02260	-0.15032	-0.1947497E-01	-0.04081
	PWHITES	% OF WHITE STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOL	0.19079	0.03640	0.01381	0.13317	0.1803418	0.28047
2	PTEACHAB	TEACHER ABSENCE RATE FOR SCHOOL--80-81%	0.36886	0.13605	0.09965	-0.33072	-0.3127978	-0.05775
	PTOTSUS	SUSPENSION RATE FOR ALL REASONS--% ADM	0.42946	0.18444	0.04838	-0.28095	-0.2737551E-02	-0.01491
3	D2NCEALL	AVER.CTBS R.COMP.NCE GAIN SCORE--ALL STU	0.52896	0.27979	0.09535	-0.20264	-0.4778469E-02	-0.00226
	D2MWDIFF	AV.MINORITY LESS AV.WHITE COMP.NCE GAIN	0.54297	0.29481	0.01502	-0.02969	0.2942584E-01	0.00965
4	T2NCEALL	SCHL AVER. 80-81 CTBS R.COMP.POST-T NCE	0.69447	0.48229	0.18747	0.51324	0.1687451	0.12278
	T2MWDIFF	AV.MINERITY-AV.WHITE R.COMP.POST-T NCE	0.77670	0.60326	0.12097	0.41883	0.1891513	0.11063
5	PTOTNP	PERCENT OF TOTAL THAT ARE NONPROMOTES	0.83002	0.68894	0.08568	-0.57757	-0.1160473	-0.19914
6	PFTOTAL	% OF 'F' GRADES	0.93063	0.86607	0.17713	-0.88185	-0.5972147	-0.73647
	(CONSTANT)						97.94089	

Table 2

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN

ELEVEN SELECTED 1980-81 SCHOOL BASED INDICES

	PADA	POVRATE	T2NCEALL	D2NCEALL	PFTOTAL	PTOTSUS	PTEACHAB	PWHITES	PTOTNP	T2MWDIFF	D2MWDIFF
PADA	1.00000	-0.15032	0.51324	-0.20264	-0.88185	-0.28095	-0.33072	0.13317	-0.57757	0.41883	-0.02969
POVRATE	-0.15032	1.00000	-0.41205	-0.45993	0.24599	0.38534	0.01065	-0.10888	0.36042	0.23113	0.03282
T2NCEALL	0.51324	-0.41205	1.00000	0.15655	-0.58085	-0.23502	-0.19710	0.34418	-0.16414	-0.03276	-0.12699
D2NCEALL	-0.20264	-0.45993	0.15655	1.00000	0.12856	-0.14335	-0.07681	-0.04010	0.65652	-0.29778	0.22535
PFTOTAL	-0.88185	0.24599	-0.58085	0.12856	1.00000	0.25698	0.34614	-0.37677	0.53491	-0.35061	0.02776
PTOTSUS	-0.28095	0.38534	-0.23502	-0.14335	0.25698	1.00000	0.15375	0.18973	-0.10324	0.06562	0.18109
PTEACHAB	-0.33072	0.01065	-0.19710	-0.07681	0.34614	0.15375	1.00000	-0.14196	0.17320	0.01722	0.15345
PWHITES	0.13317	-0.10888	0.34418	-0.04010	-0.37677	-0.18973	-0.14196	1.00000	-0.32229	0.16308	0.18302
PTOTNP	-0.57757	-0.36042	-0.16414	0.65652	0.53491	-0.10324	0.17320	-0.32229	1.00000	-0.54226	0.05325
T2MWDIFF	0.41883	0.23113	-0.03276	-0.29778	-0.35061	0.06562	0.01722	0.16308	-0.54226	1.00000	0.25736
D2MWDIFF	-0.02969	0.03282	-0.12699	0.22535	0.02776	0.18109	0.15345	0.18302	0.05325	0.25736	1.00000

PADA: Average Daily Attendance Rate

POVRATE: Poverty Rate (Based on proportion of Students in school receiving free or reduced price lunches)

TZNCEALL: School Average CTBS Reading Comprehension Post-Test NCE Score for All Students

DZNCEALL: School Average CTBS Reading Comprehension NCE Gain Score for All Students

PFTOTAL: Percent of F Grades Given in All Subjects in School

PTOTSUS: Percent of School's Average Daily Membership Represented By the Total Number of Suspensions Given for the Five Major Reasons

PTEACHAB: Average Percent of Teachers Absent in School

PWHITES: Percent of School's Average Daily Membership Represented by White Students

PTOTNP: Percent of School's Average Daily Membership Represented by School's Total Non-Promotes

T2MWDIFF: A School's CTBS Reading Comprehension Post-Test NCE Discrepancy Index Derived by Subtracting the Average White Student Score from the Average Minority Score

D2MWDIFF: A School's CTBS Reading Comprehension NCE Gain Score Disparity Index Derived by Subtracting the Average White Student Gain Score from the Average Minority Student Gain Score.

Table 3

STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF SCHOOL AVERAGE

DAILY ATTENDANCE RATE FROM ACADEMIC INDICATORS

MULTIPLE REGRESSION VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 4

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. PADA 1980-81 AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN %

SUMMARY TABLE

VARIABLE		MULTIPLE R	R SQUARE	RSQ CHANGE	SIMPLE R	B	BETA
T2NCEALL	SCHL AVER. 80-81 CTBS R.COMP.POST-T NCE	0.51324	0.26342	0.26342	0.51324	0.6842473E-01	0.04979
T2MWDIFF	AV.MINORITY-AV.WHITE R.COMP.POST-T NCE	0.67335	0.45341	0.18999	0.41883	0.2877545	0.12151
D2NCEALL	AVER.CTBS R.COMP.NCE GAIN SCORE--ALL STU	0.69321	0.48053	0.02713	-0.20264	-0.6039346E-03	-0.00029
D2MWDIFF	AV.MINORITY LESS AV.WHITE COMP.NCE GAIN	0.69354	0.48099	0.00046	-0.02969	-0.2161361	-0.07092
PTOTNP	PERCENT OF TOTAL THAT ARE NONPROMOTIES	0.74442	0.55417	0.07318	-0.57757	-0.5310389E-01	-0.09113
FFTOTAL	% OF 'F' GRADES	0.89697	0.80455	0.25038	-0.88185	-0.6197432	-0.76351
(CONSTANT)						93.20296	

Table 4

STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF SCHOOL AVERAGE

DAILY ATTENDANCE RATE FROM NON-ACADEMIC INDICATORS

MULTIPLE REGRESSION VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 5

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. PADA 1980-81 AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN %

SUMMARY TABLE

VARIABLE		MULTIPLE R	R SQUARE	RSQ CHANGE	SIMPLE R	B	BETA
PTEACHAB	TEACHER ABSENCE RATE FOR SCHOOL--80-81%	0.33072	0.10938	0.10938	-0.33072	-1.472971	-0.27197
PTOTSUS	SUSPENSION RATE FOR ALL REASONS--% ADM	0.40448	0.16360	0.05423	-0.28095	0.4624126E-01	0.25180
PWHITES	% OF WHITE STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOL	0.42829	0.18343	0.01983	0.13317	0.8904894E-01	0.13849
POVRATE	% OF 1980-81 STUDENTS EATING FREE LUNCH	0.42946	0.18444	0.00101	-0.15032	-0.1685479E-01	-0.03532
(CONSTANT)						86.24304	

Table 5

STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF SCHOOL AVERAGE

DAILY ATTENDANCE RATE FROM SCHOOL PROCESS INDICATORS

MULTIPLE REGRESSION — VARIABLE LIST 1
REGRESSION LIST 3

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. PADA 1980-81 AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN %

SUMMARY TABLE

VARIABLE		MULTIPLE R	R SQUARE	RSQ CHANGE	SIMPLE R	B	BETA
PTEACHAB	TEACHER ABSENCE RATE FOR SCHOOL--80-81%	0.33072	0.10938	0.10938	-0.33072	-1.787092	-0.32997
P1015US	SUSPENSION RATE FOR ALL REASONS--% ADM	0.40448	0.16360	0.05423	-0.28095	-0.5503636E-01	-0.29969
D2NCEALL	AVER.CTBS R.COMP.NCE GAIN SCORE--ALL STU	0.48201	0.23233	0.06873	-0.20264	-0.6404660	-0.30330
D2MWDIFF	AV.MIACRITY LESS AV.WHITE COMP.NCE GAIN	0.50052	0.25052	0.01819	-0.02969	0.4375506	0.14356
(CONSTANT)						89.05242	

APPENDIX A

T - T E S T

GROUP 1 - ATTEND3 EQ 1. HIGH ATTENDANCE SCHOOLS (1/3)
GROUP 2 - ATTEND3 EQ 3. LOW ATTENDANCE SCHOOLS (1/3)

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
PWNPFORD PERCNT OF OTHER NP RATE THAT BLKS HAVE												
GROUP 1	12	78.0328	50.514	14.582								
					1.60	0.433	0.19	23	0.848	0.15	20.97	0.850
GROUP 2	13	74.5208	39.963	11.084								
PFTB17 % OF TOTAL 80-81 GRADE 7 GRADES THAT= F												
GROUP 1	8	22.0738	7.417	2.622								
					1.10	0.900	-4.19	14	0.001	-4.15	13.97	0.001
GROUP 2	8	38.0137	7.790	2.754								
PFTB16 % OF TOTAL 80-81 GRADE 8 GRADES THAT= F												
GROUP 1	8	23.7969	8.312	2.939								
					2.82	0.195	-3.57	14	0.003	-3.57	11.41	0.004
GROUP 2	8	36.0246	4.951	1.751								
PFTB19 % OF TOTAL 80-81 GRADE 9 GRADES THAT= F												
GROUP 1	7	23.6204	8.104	3.063								
					1.62	0.541	-4.03	13	0.001	-3.96	11.39	0.002
GROUP 2	8	38.6921	6.368	2.252								
PFTBT10 % OF TOTAL 80-81 GRADE 10 GRADES THAT= F												
GROUP 1	3	30.4435	7.893	4.557								
					1.27	0.971	-2.42	6	0.052 ?	-2.51	4.81	0.054
GROUP 2	5	45.6046	8.890	3.976								
PFTBT11 % OF TOTAL 80-81 GRADE 11 GRADES THAT= F												
GROUP 1	5	23.7437	7.539	3.372								
					1.31	0.802	-2.09	8	0.069 ?	-2.09	7.86	0.069
GROUP 2	5	34.4705	8.617	3.854								
PFTBT12 % OF TOTAL 80-81 GRADE 12 GRADES THAT= F												
GROUP 1	5	14.9301	3.354	1.500								
					8.03	0.068 ?	-1.66	8	0.136	-1.66	4.98	0.159
GROUP 2	5	22.3896	9.503	4.250								
POVRATE % OF 1980-81 STUDENTS EATING FREE LUNCH												
GROUP 1	13	63.8231	12.897	3.577								
					1.80	0.320	-2.10	24	0.047	-2.10	22.17	0.048
GROUP 2	13	73.1692	9.800	2.663								

COMPUTER PROGRAM AND DATA ANALYSES BY JIM ZAFIRAU, PH.D.
FILE GRADING (CREATION DATE = 02/25/82) 1980-81 TO 1981-82 GRADING STUDY GRADES 7-12 CITY-WIDE

T - T E S T

GROUP 1 - ATTEND3 EQ 1.
GROUP 2 - ATTEND3 EQ 3.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
T2NCEALL SCHL AVER. 80-81 CTBS R.COMP.POST-T NCE												
GROUP 1	13	42.7219	6.256	1.735	9.57	0.000	2.43	24	0.023	2.43	14.48	0.029
GROUP 2	13	38.2818	2.023	0.561								
T2NCEMIN SCHL AVER.MINORITY CTBS R.COMP.PST-T NCE												
GROUP 1	13	41.0728	5.669	1.572	9.26	0.001	2.93	24	0.007	2.93	14.56	0.010
GROUP 2	13	36.2178	1.863	0.517								
T2NCEWHT SCHL AVER.WHITE CTBS R.COMP.POST-T NCE												
GROUP 1	13	47.4800	6.955	1.929	2.78	0.089	1.21	24	0.237	1.21	19.64	0.240
GROUP 2	13	44.7543	4.170	1.156								
D2NCEALL AVER.CTBS R.COMP.NCE GAIN SCORE--ALL STU												
GROUP 1	12	-0.1553	4.130	1.192	1.84	0.310	0.51	23	0.613	0.51	20.16	0.618
GROUP 2	13	-0.8963	3.045	0.845								
D2NCEMIN AVER.MINORITY CTBS R.COMP.GAIN SCORE												
GROUP 1	12	0.0187	4.114	1.188	1.76	0.336	0.46	23	0.652	0.45	20.35	0.657
GROUP 2	13	-0.6414	3.083	0.855								
D2NCEWHT AVER.80-81 WHITE CTBS R.COMP. GAIN SCORE												
GROUP 1	12	-0.8705	4.471	1.291	1.84	0.310	0.48	23	0.638	0.47	20.16	0.643
GROUP 2	13	-1.6157	3.296	0.914								
PTEACHAB TEACHER ABSENCE RATE FOR SCHOOL--80-81%												
GROUP 1	12	5.9192	1.550	0.447	1.35	0.612	-0.87	23	0.393	-0.87	21.83	0.396
GROUP 2	13	6.4215	1.334	0.370								
PSCFENGL PERCENT OF ALL 80-81 ENGL.GRADES THAT= F												
GROUP 1	13	20.8867	9.316	2.584	1.64	0.406	-3.89	24	0.001	-3.85	22.68	0.001
GROUP 2	13	33.6610	7.284	2.020								

T - T E S T

GROUP 1 - ATTEND3 EQ 1.
GROUP 2 - ATTEND3 EQ 3.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE F VALUE	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE 2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE 2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE 2-TAIL PROB.
PSEFMATH PERCENT OF ALL 80-81 MATH GRADES THAT=F												
GROUP 1	13	25.6546	8.156	2.262								
					1.17	0.793	-5.71	24	0.000	-5.71	23.86	0.000
GROUP 2	13	43.2662	7.548	2.093								
PSEFSCI PERCNT OF ALL 8081 SCIENCE GRADES THAT=F												
GROUP 1	13	20.5280	8.128	2.254								
					1.00	0.994	-5.95	24	0.000	-5.95	24.00	0.000
GROUP 2	13	39.4681	8.109	2.249								
PSEFSS PERCENT OF ALL 80-81 S.S. GRADES THAT=F												
GROUP 1	13	25.3250	5.139	1.425								
					1.85	0.300	-4.52	24	0.000	-4.52	22.03	0.000
GROUP 2	13	36.2072	6.993	1.939								
PFT0T7 % OF TOTAL 80-81 GRADE 7 GRADES THAT=F												
GROUP 1	8	22.0738	7.417	2.622								
					1.19	0.900	-4.19	14	0.001	-4.19	13.97	0.001
GROUP 2	8	38.0137	7.790	2.754								
PFT0T8 % OF TOTAL 80-81 GRADE 8 GRADES THAT=F												
GROUP 1	8	23.7969	8.312	2.939								
					2.82	0.195	-3.57	14	0.003	-3.57	11.41	0.004
GROUP 2	8	36.0246	4.951	1.751								
PFT0T9 % OF TOTAL 80-81 GRADE 9 GRADES THAT=F												
GROUP 1	7	23.6204	8.104	3.063								
					1.62	0.541	-4.03	13	0.001	-3.96	11.39	0.002
GROUP 2	8	38.6921	6.368	2.252								
PFT0T10 % OF TOTAL 80-81 GRADE 10 GRADES THAT=F												
GROUP 1	3	30.4435	7.893	4.557								
					1.27	0.971	-2.42	6	0.052?	-2.51	4.81	0.054
GROUP 2	5	45.6046	8.890	3.976								
PFT0T11 % OF TOTAL 80-81 GRADE 11 GRADES THAT=F												
GROUP 1	5	23.7437	7.539	3.372								
					1.31	0.802	-2.09	8	0.069?	-2.09	7.86	0.069
GROUP 2	5	34.4705	8.617	3.854								

FILE GRADING (CREATION DATE = 02/25/82) 1980-81 TO 1981-82 GRADING STUDY GRADES 7-12 CITY-WIDE

T - T E S T

GROUP 1 - ATTEND3 EQ 1.
GROUP 2 - ATTEND3 EQ 3.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE 2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE 2-TAIL PROB.
PFTOT12 % OF TOTAL 80-81 GRADE 12 GRADES THAT F												
GROUP 1	5	14.9301	3.354	1.500								
					8.03	0.068	-1.66	8	0.136	-1.66	4.98	0.159
GROUP 2	5	22.3896	9.503	4.250								
PABA 1980-81 AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN %												
GROUP 1	13	82.7131	3.867	1.072								
					1.01	0.991	8.86	24	0.000	8.86	24.00	0.000
GROUP 2	13	69.2496	3.880	1.076								
P1DTSUS SUSPENSION RATE FOR ALL REASONS--% ADM												
GROUP 1	13	55.9777	27.302	7.572								
					2.20	0.187	-2.73	24	0.012	-2.73	21.05	0.013
GROUP 2	13	92.9287	40.474	11.226								
PSUSR1 SUS.RATE FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY												
GROUP 1	13	10.8168	7.752	2.150								
					1.90	0.279	-1.15	24	0.263	-1.15	21.88	0.264
GROUP 2	13	15.0133	10.697	2.967								
PSUSR2 SUS.RATE FOR FIGHTING,HITTING&PUSHING												
GROUP 1	13	14.5010	10.872	3.015								
					1.01	0.982	-0.38	24	0.705	-0.38	24.00	0.705
GROUP 2	13	16.1409	10.945	3.035								
PSUSR3 SUS.RATE FOR FAIL.TO ATTEND ALL CLASSES												
GROUP 1	13	8.4502	3.624	1.005								
					12.65	0.000	-2.34	24	0.028	-2.34	13.89	0.035
GROUP 2	13	17.1361	12.888	3.575								
PSUSR4 SUS.RATE FOR FAIL.TO ATEND SC-CL ON TIME												
GROUP 1	13	3.5971	4.507	1.250								
					9.98	0.000	-2.48	24	0.020	-2.48	14.38	0.026
GROUP 2	13	13.8768	14.240	3.950								
PSUSP5 SUS.RATE FOR DISRUPTION OF ENTIRE SCHOOL												
GROUP 1	13	14.9878	8.239	2.285								
					2.13	0.204	-1.61	24	0.119	-1.61	21.23	0.121
GROUP 2	13	21.5184	12.031	3.337								

COMPUTER PROGRAM AND DATA ANALYSES BY JIM ZAFIRAU, PH.D.
FILE GRADING (CREATION DATE = 02/25/82) 1980-81 TO 1981-82 GRADING STUDY GRADES 7-12 CITY-WIDE

T - T E S T

GROUP 1 - ATTEND3 EQ 1.
GROUP 2 - ATTEND3 EQ 3.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
PTOTCP SCHOOL CORPORAL PUNISH.RATE AS % OF ADM												
GROUP 1	10	28.3043	25.600	8.095	1.15	0.836	-0.08	18	0.937	-0.08	17.91	0.937
GROUP 2	10	29.2550	27.486	8.692								
PAMERNAT % OF AMERICAN NATIVES												
GROUP 1	13	0.3161	0.173	0.048	2.60	0.111	-0.77	24	0.447	-0.77	20.04	0.448
GROUP 2	13	0.3867	0.280	0.078								
PWHITES % OF WHITE STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOL												
GROUP 1	13	28.7867	9.558	2.651	1.15	0.809	-0.15	24	0.885	-0.15	23.88	0.885
GROUP 2	13	29.3565	10.265	2.847								
PBLACKS % OF BLACK STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOL												
GROUP 1	13	71.9537	14.292	3.964	1.69	0.374	0.90	24	0.376	0.90	22.50	0.377
GROUP 2	13	67.4486	10.978	3.045								
PASIANS % OF ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER STUDENTS												
GROUP 1	13	0.7689	1.640	0.455	3.90	0.026	0.51	24	0.618	0.51	17.77	0.619
GROUP 2	13	0.5113	0.830	0.230								
PHISPAN % OF HISPANIC STUDENTS IN SCHOOL												
GROUP 1	12	2.2079	1.472	0.425	3.55	0.044	-1.23	23	0.233	-1.25	18.56	0.225
GROUP 2	13	3.3101	2.774	0.769								
RBNPP RATIO OF BLACK NONPROMOTES TO PROMOTES												
GROUP 1	13	0.1306	0.101	0.028	6.61	0.003	-2.28	24	0.032	-2.28	15.55	0.037
GROUP 2	13	0.3061	0.259	0.072								
RONPP RATIO OF NONBLK NONPROMOTES TO PROMOTES												
GROUP 1	13	0.2146	0.221	0.061	3.02	0.067	-1.74	24	0.094	-1.74	19.15	0.097
GROUP 2	13	0.4296	0.385	0.107								

COMPUTER PROGRAM AND DATA ANALYSES BY JIM ZAFIRAU, PH.D.
FILE GRADING (CREATION DATE = 02/25/82) 1980-81 TO 1981-82 GRADING STUDY GRADES 7-12 CITY-WIDE

T - T E S T

GROUP 1 - ATTEND3 EQ 1.
GROUP 2 - ATTEND3 EQ 3.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	F 2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE 2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE 2-TAIL PROB.
PICTNP PERCENT OF TOTAL THAT ARE NONPROMOTES												
GROUP 1	13	11.9134	7.640	2.119	2.64	0.107	-2.51	24	0.019	-2.51	19.96	0.021
GROUP 2	13	22.0491	12.403	3.440								
PWNPFORD PERCENT OF OTHER NP RATE THAT BLKS HAVE												
GROUP 1	12	78.0328	50.514	14.582	1.60	0.433	0.19	23	0.848	0.19	20.97	0.850
GROUP 2	13	74.5208	39.963	11.084								
PAGEADV PERCENT OF TOTAL THAT ARE AGE ADVANCMNTS												
GROUP 1	12	1.5747	2.743	0.792	1.17	0.817	0.16	21	0.876	0.16	21.00	0.875
GROUP 2	11	1.3995	2.542	0.766								
PATOTAL % OF 'A' GRADES												
GROUP 1	13	13.8547	4.080	1.132	3.45	0.041	1.98	24	0.059	1.98	18.42	0.063
GROUP 2	13	11.3081	2.198	0.610								
PBTOTAL % OF 'B' GRADES												
GROUP 1	13	18.0179	3.906	1.083	3.85	0.027	4.00	24	0.001	4.00	17.84	0.001
GROUP 2	13	13.1583	1.991	0.552								
PCTOTAL % OF 'C' GRADES												
GROUP 1	13	21.9287	2.968	0.823	1.51	0.488	4.58	24	0.000	4.58	23.06	0.000
GROUP 2	13	17.0613	2.417	0.670								
PDTOTAL % OF 'D' GRADES												
GROUP 1	13	19.9024	2.919	0.810	2.13	0.204	2.61	24	0.015	2.61	21.22	0.016
GROUP 2	13	17.3408	1.999	0.554								
PFTOTAL % OF 'F' GRADES												
GROUP 1	13	20.1677	6.025	1.671	1.01	0.985	-6.09	24	0.000	-6.09	24.00	0.000
GROUP 2	13	34.5998	6.058	1.680								

T - T E S T

GROUP 1 - ATTEND3 EQ 1.
GROUP 2 - ATTEND3 EQ 3.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE 2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE 2-TAIL PROB.
PCTOTAL % OF 'OTHER' GRADES INCOMPLETE ETC.												
GROUP 1	13	6.1285	3.204	0.889	1.40	0.570	-0.35	24	0.732	-0.35	23.36	0.732
GROUP 2	13	6.5315	2.710	0.752								
PF7ENGL % OF F'S IN GRADE 7 ENGLISH												
GROUP 1	8	19.6565	11.336	4.008	1.27	0.763	-2.56	14	0.023	-2.56	13.81	0.023
GROUP 2	8	33.3683	10.074	3.562								
PF8ENGL % OF F'S IN GRADE 8 ENGLISH												
GROUP 1	8	20.1656	10.393	3.674	4.54	0.064 ?	-2.40	14	0.031	-2.40	9.94	0.037
GROUP 2	8	29.9194	4.879	1.725								
PF9ENGL % OF F'S IN GRADE 9 ENGLISH												
GROUP 1	7	23.3466	12.505	4.726	3.59	0.119	-1.86	13	0.085 ?	-1.79	8.83	0.107
GROUP 2	8	32.7777	6.680	2.334								
PF10ENGL % OF F'S IN GRADE 10 ENGLISH												
GROUP 1	3	28.7683	12.009	6.933	1.33	0.723	-2.00	6	0.092 ?	-1.92	3.83	0.127
GROUP 2	5	44.8336	10.430	4.664								
PF11ENGL % OF F'S IN GRADE 11 ENGLISH												
GROUP 1	5	22.8490	10.040	4.490	1.29	0.809	-1.47	8	0.181	-1.47	7.87	0.181
GROUP 2	5	32.8227	11.418	5.106								
PF12ENGL % OF F'S IN GRADE 12 ENGLISH												
GROUP 1	5	11.0277	4.121	1.843	7.64	0.074 ?	-2.01	8	0.080 ?	-2.01	5.03	0.101
GROUP 2	5	21.8980	11.389	5.093								
PF7MATH % OF F'S IN GRADE 7 MATH												
GROUP 1	8	23.3053	9.281	3.281	2.23	0.312	-3.31	14	0.005	-3.31	12.23	0.006
GROUP 2	8	42.7995	13.860	4.900								

T - T E S T

GROUP 1 - ATTEND3 EQ 1.
GROUP 2 - ATTEND3 EQ 3.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
PF8MATH % OF F'S IN GRADE 8 MATH												
GROUP 1	8	28.1811	7.289	2.577	1.38	0.684	-2.87	14	0.012	-2.87	13.66	0.012
GROUP 2	8	39.5785	8.549	3.023								
PF9MATH % OF F'S IN GRADE 9 MATH												
GROUP 1	7	23.4768	9.577	3.620	1.06	0.927	-4.32	13	0.001	-4.32	12.62	0.001
GROUP 2	8	44.5823	9.304	3.289								
PF10MATH % OF F'S IN GRADE 10 MATH												
GROUP 1	3	39.2465	6.644	3.836	1.71	0.582	-3.37	6	0.015	-3.12	3.44	0.052
GROUP 2	5	53.1666	5.084	2.274								
PF11MATH % OF F'S IN GRADE 11 MATH												
GROUP 1	5	24.8020	7.819	3.497	1.80	0.583	-1.05	8	0.324	-1.05	7.40	0.328
GROUP 2	5	29.3863	5.828	2.606								
PF12MATH % OF F'S IN GRADE 12 MATH												
GROUP 1	5	21.2979	12.306	5.503	9.58	0.050	-0.48	8	0.645	-0.48	4.83	0.652
GROUP 2	5	24.0698	3.975	1.778								
PF7SCI % OF F'S IN GRADE 7 SCIENCE												
GROUP 1	8	21.2992	10.376	3.668	1.11	0.898	-3.73	14	0.002	-3.73	13.96	0.002
GROUP 2	8	40.1631	9.868	3.489								
PF8SCI % OF F'S IN GRADE 8 SCIENCE												
GROUP 1	8	21.7139	13.583	4.802	1.79	0.458	-2.99	14	0.010	-2.99	12.95	0.010
GROUP 2	8	39.6216	10.139	3.585								
PF9SCI % OF F'S IN GRADE 9 SCIENCE												
GROUP 1	7	16.3636	8.140	3.077	1.55	0.611	-3.14	13	0.008	-3.19	12.93	0.007
GROUP 2	8	31.4255	10.126	3.580								

COMPUTER PROGRAM AND DATA ANALYSES BY JIM ZAFIRAU, PH.D.
FILE GRADING (CREATION DATE = 02/25/82) 1980-81 TO 1981-82 GRADING STUDY GRADES 7-12 CITY-WIDE

T-T E-S-T

GROUP 1 - ATTEND3 EQ 1.
GROUP 2 - ATTEND3 EQ 3.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	F 2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE 2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE DEGREES OF FREEDOM	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE 2-TAIL PROB.
PF10SCI - % OF F'S IN GRADE 10 SCIENCE												
GROUP 1	3	27.7965	8.701	5.023	1.04	0.868	-2.74	6	0.034	-2.72	4.27	0.053
GROUP 2	5	44.9941	8.546	3.822								
PF11SCI - % OF F'S IN GRADE 11 SCIENCE												
GROUP 1	5	19.6412	7.564	3.383	2.49	0.398	-3.73	8	0.006	-3.73	6.77	0.007
GROUP 2	5	34.5951	4.793	2.143								
PF12SCI - % OF F'S IN GRADE 12 SCIENCE												
GROUP 1	4	8.7438	10.430	5.215	1.32	0.853	-0.41	7	0.695	-0.42	6.91	0.690
GROUP 2	5	11.8546	11.987	5.361								
PF7SS - % OF F'S IN GRADE 7 SOCIAL STUDIES												
GROUP 1	8	23.8808	6.746	2.385	1.42	0.658	-3.17	14	0.007	-3.17	13.60	0.007
GROUP 2	8	35.6316	8.027	2.838								
PF8SS - % OF F'S IN GRADE 8 SOCIAL STUDIES												
GROUP 1	8	25.6491	8.232	2.910	1.35	0.703	-2.15	14	0.050	-2.15	13.70	0.050
GROUP 2	8	33.8934	7.087	2.506								
PF9SS - % OF F'S IN GRADE 9 SOCIAL STUDIES												
GROUP 1	7	27.4009	5.481	2.071	1.98	0.424	-3.90	13	0.002	-3.95	12.54	0.002
GROUP 2	8	41.0653	7.708	2.725								
PF10SS - % OF F'S IN GRADE 10 SOCIAL STUDIES												
GROUP 1	2	36.2511	0.544	0.385	340.91	0.081	-0.01	5	0.989	-0.02	4.06	0.982
GROUP 2	5	36.3604	10.049	4.494								
PF11SS - % OF F'S IN GRADE 11 SOCIAL STUDIES												
GROUP 1	5	26.4196	8.740	3.909	1.70	0.620	-1.75	8	0.118	-1.75	7.50	0.123
GROUP 2	5	37.6711	11.397	5.097								

FILE GRADING (CREATION DATE = 02/25/82) 1980-81 TO 1981-82 GRADING STUDY GRADES 7-12 CITY-WIDE

T-TEST

GROUP 1 - ATTEND3 EQ 1.
GROUP 2 - ATTEND3 EQ 3.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.	SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
PF12SS # OF F'S IN GRADE 12 SOCIAL STUDIES												
GROUP 1	5	20.6386	11.865	5.306	1.24	0.842	-0.32	8	0.757	-0.32	7.91	0.757
GROUP 2	5	23.1787	13.194	5.901								
SCHNGR												
GROUP 1	13	825.2308	13.148	3.646	1.10	0.869	0.90	24	0.376	0.90	23.94	0.376
GROUP 2	13	820.6923	12.526	3.474								
TENWDIFF AV.MINORITY-AV.WHITE R.COMP.POST-TENCE												
GROUP 1	13	-6.4072	3.268	0.906	1.64	0.403	1.45	24	0.161	1.45	22.66	0.162
GROUP 2	13	-8.5364	4.187	1.161								
DENWDIFF AV.MINORITY LESS AV.WHITE COMP.NCE GAIN												
GROUP 1	12	0.8892	2.224	0.642	3.70	0.034	-0.12	23	0.905	-0.12	16.25	0.907
GROUP 2	13	0.9742	1.157	0.321								

APPENDIX B

ELAPSED TIME REQUIRED.. 33.14 SECONDS

```
381 PEARSON CORR   PADA WITH     PFTOTT TO PFTOT12, PSCFENGL TO D2HHDIFF,
382                                T2NCEALL TO D2NCEHHT, PTEACHAB, POVRATE, PHNPFORB
383 OPTIONS        3,6
384 STATISTICS     1
```

***** PEARSON CORR PROBLEM REQUIRES 3648 BYTES WORKSPACE *****

FILE GRADING (CREATION DATE = 02/25/82) 1980-81 TO 1981-82 GRADING STUDY GRADES 7-12 CITY-WIDE

VARIABLE	CASES	MEAN	STD DEV
PACA	39	75.7617	6.5135
PF10TT	24	29.7855	9.4625
PF10T8	24	30.8064	7.7503
PF10T9	24	31.0217	9.2635
PF10T10	13	42.0151	9.7606
PF10T11	15	29.9486	8.7443
PF10T12	15	19.4921	6.9609
PSCFENGL	39	28.1477	9.3212
PSCFMATH	39	35.8704	10.8594
PSCFSCI	39	31.5582	10.9767
PSCFSS	39	30.4240	7.5200
PTCTSUS	39	72.5970	34.9252
PSUSR1	39	13.6953	10.0311
PSUSR2	39	13.7052	9.4348
PSUSR3	39	12.8597	9.7670
PSUSR4	39	7.8922	9.8753
PSUSPS	39	17.9888	10.0358
PTCTCP	30	22.7442	23.3488
PAPERNAT	39	0.3345	0.2384
PWHITES	39	28.5202	10.0500
PBLACKS	39	67.8429	13.3611
PASIANS	39	0.6498	1.1727
PHISPAN	38	3.5932	4.8010
RBNPP	39	0.2235	0.2037
RONPP	39	0.3110	0.2876
PTOTNP	39	17.2545	10.9382
PWAPFORB	38	77.5480	46.6171
PAGEADV	36	1.2486	2.1962
PATOTAL	39	12.2008	3.0822
PBTOTAL	39	15.4872	3.3624
PCTOTAL	39	19.3624	3.1978
PDTOTAL	39	10.7563	2.4214
PFTOTAL	39	28.3108	8.1690
PDTOTAL	39	5.8824	2.6259
PF7ENGL	24	25.2786	11.2358
PF8ENGL	24	26.6074	8.4632
PF9ENGL	24	29.0268	9.3275
PF10ENGL	13	39.6266	10.6950
PF11ENGL	15	28.5576	11.1123
PF12ENGL	15	17.8554	8.5521
PF7MATH	24	34.4099	13.4056
PF8MATH	24	35.4812	8.8768
PF9MATH	24	34.2137	13.0868
PF10MATH	13	49.1799	9.4173
PF11MATH	15	28.0217	8.4675
PF12MATH	15	20.0996	8.1542
PF7SCI	24	31.5798	12.3460
PF8SCI	24	31.3226	12.2946
PF9SCI	24	24.0818	10.3478
PF10SCI	13	42.9613	11.7329
PF11SCI	15	25.7860	9.1777
PF12SCI	14	12.1730	11.8518
PF7SS	24	27.8462	8.2287

COMPUTER PROGRAM AND DATA ANALYSES BY JIH ZAFIRAU, PH.D.
FILE GRADING (CREATION DATE = 02/25/82) 1980-81 TO 1981-82 GRADING STUDY GRADES 7-12 CITY-WIDE

VARIABLE	CASES	MEAN	STD DEV
PF8SS	24	29.6612	8.7537
PF9SS	24	32.5191	9.6664
PF10SS	12	33.0596	10.6502
PF11SS	15	32.7645	11.8878
PF12SS	15	20.9917	10.3611
SCHNOX	39	822.8718	12.7159
T2MWDIFF	39	-7.9476	3.5935
D2MWDIFF	38	0.6348	2.0472
T2MCEALL	39	40.3456	4.6268
T2MCEMIN	39	38.3905	4.2982
T2MCEWHT	39	46.3381	5.3253
D2MCEALL	38	-0.9933	3.4539
D2MCEMIN	38	-0.8379	3.5387
D2MCEWHT	38	-1.4727	3.6991
PTEACHAB	38	6.1713	1.2827
POVRATE	39	68.5461	12.7045

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

VARIABLE PAIR		VARIABLE PAIR		VARIABLE PAIR		VARIABLE PAIR		VARIABLE PAIR		VARIABLE PAIR	
PADA	-0.7597	PADA	-0.8050	PADA	-0.8030	PADA	-0.7812	PADA	-0.7378	PADA	-0.5341
WITH	N(24)	WITH	N(24)	WITH	N(24)	WITH	N(13)	WITH	N(15)	WITH	N(15)
PFTOT7	SIG .000	PFTOT8	SIG .000	PFTOT9	SIG .000	PFTOT10	SIG .002	PFTOT11	SIG .002	PFTOT12	SIG .040
PADA	-0.7790	PADA	-0.7550	PADA	-0.8282	PADA	-0.7312	PADA	-0.7597	PADA	-0.8050
WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(24)	WITH	N(24)
PSCFENGL	SIG .000	PSCFMATH	SIG .000	PSCFSCI	SIG .000	PSCFSS	SIG .000	PFTOT7	SIG .000	PFTOT8	SIG .000
PADA	-0.8030	PADA	-0.7812	PADA	-0.7378	PADA	-0.5341	PADA	1.0000	PADA	-0.3655
WITH	N(24)	WITH	N(13)	WITH	N(15)	WITH	N(15)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)
PFTOT9	SIG .000	PFTOT10	SIG .002	PFTOT11	SIG .002	PFTOT12	SIG .040	PADA	SIG .000	PTOTSUS	SIG .022
PADA	-0.1984	PADA	0.0824	PADA	-0.3815	PADA	-0.4816	PADA	-0.0951	PADA	0.0871
WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(30)
PSUSR1	SIG .226	PSUSR2	SIG .618	PSUSR3	SIG .017	PSLSR4	SIG .002	PSUSP5	SIG .565	PTOTGP	SIG .647
PADA	-0.0785	PADA	0.1322	PADA	0.0074	PADA	0.0803	PADA	-0.1203	PADA	-0.5671
WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(38)	WITH	N(39)
PAMERNAT	SIG .635	PWHITES	SIG .422	PBLACKS	SIG .965	PASIANS	SIG .627	PHISPAN	SIG .472	RBNPP	SIG .000
PADA	-0.5317	PADA	-0.6294	PADA	0.0094	PADA	0.2399	PADA	0.6183	PADA	0.8188
WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(38)	WITH	N(36)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)
RONPP	SIG .000	PTOTNP	SIG .000	PWNPFORB	SIG .955	PAGEADV	SIG .159	PATOTAL	SIG .000	PBTOTAL	SIG .000
PADA	0.7265	PADA	0.3830	PADA	-0.8990	PADA	-0.2155	PADA	-0.6550	PADA	-0.6497
WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(24)	WITH	N(24)
PCTOTAL	SIG .000	PBTOTAL	SIG .016	PFTOTAL	SIG .000	POTOTAL	SIG .188	PF7ENGL	SIG .001	PF8ENGL	SIG .001
PADA	-0.5642	PADA	-0.7499	PADA	-0.6528	PADA	-0.7540	PADA	-0.6321	PADA	-0.7191
WITH	N(24)	WITH	N(13)	WITH	N(15)	WITH	N(15)	WITH	N(24)	WITH	N(24)
PF9ENGL	SIG .004	PF10ENGL	SIG .003	PF11ENGL	SIG .008	PF12ENGL	SIG .001	PF7MATH	SIG .001	PF8MATH	SIG .000
PADA	-0.7245	PADA	-0.5234	PADA	-0.3101	PADA	-0.0249	PADA	-0.6660	PADA	-0.6719
WITH	N(24)	WITH	N(13)	WITH	N(15)	WITH	N(15)	WITH	N(24)	WITH	N(24)
PF9MATH	SIG .000	PF10MATH	SIG .066	PF11MATH	SIG .261	PF12MATH	SIG .930	PF7SCI	SIG .000	PF8SCI	SIG .000

A VALUE OF 99.0000 IS PRINTED IF A COEFFICIENT CANNOT BE COMPUTED.

P E A R S O N C O R R E L A T I O N C O E F F I C I E N T S

VARIABLE PAIR		VARIABLE PAIR		VARIABLE PAIR		VARIABLE PAIR		VARIABLE PAIR		VARIABLE PAIR	
PADA	-0.7407	PADA	-0.6762	PADA	-0.7446	PADA	-0.2503	PADA	-0.5816	PADA	-0.5004
WITH	N(24)	WITH	N(13)	WITH	N(15)	WITH	N(14)	WITH	N(24)	WITH	N(24)
PF9SCI	SIG .000	PF10SCI	SIG .011	PF11SCI	SIG .001	PF12SCI	SIG .388	PF7SS	SIG .003	PF8SS	SIG .013
PADA	-0.7276	PADA	-0.2630	PADA	-0.5406	PADA	-0.0082	PADA	0.3894	PADA	0.3268
WITH	N(24)	WITH	N(12)	WITH	N(15)	WITH	N(15)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)
PF9SS	SIG .000	PF10SS	SIG .409	PF11SS	SIG .037	PF12SS	SIG .977	SCHNOX	SIG .014	T2MWDIFF	SIG .042
PADA	-0.0937	PADA	0.5230	PADA	0.5757	PADA	0.2442	PADA	0.0134	PADA	-0.0067
WITH	N(38)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(38)	WITH	N(38)
D2MWDIFF	SIG .576	T2NCEALL	SIG .001	T2NCEMIN	SIG .000	T2NCEWHT	SIG .134	D2NCEALL	SIG .937	D2NCEMIN	SIG .968
PADA	0.0454	PADA	-0.1669	PADA	-0.1817	PADA	0.0094				
WITH	N(38)	WITH	N(38)	WITH	N(39)	WITH	N(38)				
D2NCEWHT	SIG .787	PTEACHAB	SIG .317	POVRATE	SIG .268	PWAFFORB	SIG .955				

--A VALUE OF 99.0000 IS PRINTED IF A COEFFICIENT CANNOT BE COMPUTED.

Consultant outlines roles to combat truancy

Michael K. Frisby

A consultant who studied the truancy problem in Cleveland schools has outlined roles that the community, school officials and business leaders should perform to stop rampant absenteeism.

Prof. Steven C. Sunderland, of the University of Cincinnati, says that involvement from these parties is necessary to stop high absenteeism, which keeps more than 13,000 pupils, or 17%, out of school daily.

His report, which was submitted to Desegregation Administrator Donald R. Waldrip, is being reviewed by the desegregation staff before it is presented to the school board education committee.

The report says:

• School-community councils should examine attendance data, looking for causes of trends, reviewing teachers' and principals' influence on the rate of absenteeism.

• Attendance workers should shift their major work from recording the failures of the system to being the source of managerial information on the trends affecting attendance in the schools.

• Research workers should determine what the characteristics are in schools with both good and bad attendance.

• Faculty from local colleges should provide training in consultation and evaluation for the schools' attendance staff.

• Business leaders should train principals and cluster leaders in managing decentralized attendance efforts and support the effort to get children to attend school.

At an education committee meeting yesterday, the school board received a proposal by an attendance committee composed of community activists, school officials and business officials who had studied the problem.

They recommended that the community contribute to solving the problem, that the board be committed to solving absenteeism and minimize problems related to desegregation and that the board review practices and policies to determine the impact on attendance.

Berthina Palmer, chairman of the education committee, asked the group to determine how much it would cost to implement the plan. She said the board might use several schools to test the plan.

In addition, Palmer said the board would probably receive Sunderland's report at the next meeting. Although there are some duplications, Palmer said the board hoped to forge a good policy from the two reports.

Board president Alva T. Bonda acknowledged that absenteeism was the most serious problem in the district, after financial woes.

Board member Stanley Tolliver maintained that after a recent visit to Martin Luther King Junior High School, he understood why some children do not come to school.

"It was dirty and dismal," said Tolliver. "Kids don't want to go there because it is filthy. Rather than saying the kids are wrong for not going to school, we must say that we are wrong for not attracting them."

★ ★ ★

Ohio fights desegregation bill

Lawyers for the state and city schools met in U.S. District Court yesterday to discuss the amount of money that the state has been ordered to pay the district for desegregation.

Federal Judge Frank J. Battisti and the U.S. Court of Appeals (6th Circuit) in Cincinnati have ordered the state, found liable in the desegregation case, to pay a share of damages. School board members have estimated that amount could reach $60 million, including reimbursement for buses.

The state has appealed the order to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Yesterday, the parties met privately and reportedly agreed on some items that can be stipulated to in court. However, sources said there was no agreement that the state was willing to pay the costs.

Discussions were to continue this morning and a court hearing may begin this afternoon.